

REMARKS

This Amendment and Response is responsive to the Office Action mailed September 29, 2004. In that action: claims 5, 6, 10, and 11 were objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c); claims 1-4 and 7-9 were objected to for informalities; claims 1 and 3 were objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1); the specification was objected to as failing to provide antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter; claims 1-3, 7, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mukherjee, et al. (USPN 6,289,223); claim 4 was rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mukherjee in view of Sikand, et al. (USPN 5,515,421); and claim 9 was rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mukherjee in view of Vedel (USPN 5,974,308).

Claims 1-11 have been canceled. New claims 12-22 have been added. These claims are substantially similar to originally-filed claims 1-11, but with modifications to address the numerous informalities therein and place them into better form for examination. Claim 12 is believed to be patentable because the prior art does not show the combination of equipping the cellular phones of the subscribers to exchange point-to-point short messages with a short-message center over the cellular phone network; forwarding short messages declared cell broadcast messages to a cell broadcast center; accepting the point-to-point short messages from a coupling instance connected to the short-message center; doing the necessary tests, adjustments and conversions of the messages in the coupling instance; filtering the subscribers; and forwarding the messages to the cell broadcast center by means of a process that applies to the cell broadcast center. Claim 18 is believed to be patentable because the prior art does not show the

combination of a coupling instance (3) connected to the short message center (2), which accepts point-to-point short messages (6); and means of doing the necessary tests, adjustments and conversions of the messages and an authentication component and/or filter component (9); wherein the coupling instance (3) is connected to the cell broadcast center (4) to which the processed messages are forwarded. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable because of their dependence on patentable independent claims and because of the additional limitations included therein. Examination and allowance of the new claims is hereby requested.

Based upon the foregoing, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP

By: 

Robert G. Crouch
Registration No. 34,806
3151 South Vaughn Way, Suite 411
Aurora, Colorado 80014
(720) 562-5506

Date: March 29, 2005